

PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL
OF COPIES OF TRANSLATION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPTER I OR CHAPTER II
OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY)
(PCT Rule 72.2)

To:

SCHAUMBURG, Karl-Heinz

Postfach 86 07 48

81634 München

ALLEMAGNE

EINGEGANGEN

22. Juni 2005

Erled.

Date of mailing (*day/month/year*)
16 June 2005 (16.06.2005)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
2002-1029 P

IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION

International application No.
PCT/EP2003/011959

International filing date (*day/month/year*)
28 October 2003 (28.10.2003)

Applicant

OCE PRINTING SYSTEMS GMBH et al

1. Transmittal of the translation to the applicant.

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation made by the International Bureau of the international preliminary examination report established by the International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. Transmittal of the copy of the translation to the elected Offices.

The International Bureau notifies the applicant that copies of that translation have been transmitted to the following elected Offices requiring such translation:

None

The following elected Offices, having waived the requirement for such a transmittal at this time, will receive copies of that translation from the International Bureau only upon their request:

EP, JP, US

3. Reminder regarding translation into (one of) the official language(s) of the elected Office(s).

The applicant is reminded that, where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report.

It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned (Rule 74.1). See Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide for further details.

The International Bureau of WIPO
34, chemin des Colombettes
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Agnes Wittmann-Regis

Facsimile No.+41 22 740 14 35

Facsimile No.+41 22 338 89 70

Translation

Rec'd PCT/PTO 07 JUL 2005
PCT/EP2003/011959



PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 2002-1029 P	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Form PCT/IPEA/416	
International application No. PCT/EP2003/011959	International filing date (day/month/year) 28 October 2003 (28.10.2003)	Priority date (day/month/year) 28 October 2002 (28.10.2002)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC G03G 15/00		
Applicant OCE PRINTING SYSTEMS GMBH		

1. This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.
3. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:
 - a. ☒ (sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of 9 sheets, as follows:
 - ☐ sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).
 - ☐ sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.
 - b. ☐ (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) _____, containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).

4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:
 - ☒ Box No. I Basis of the report
 - ☐ Box No. II Priority
 - ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
 - ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
 - ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
 - ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 27 May 2004 (27.05.2004)	Date of completion of this report 21 January 2005 (21.01.2005)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2003/011959

Box No. I Basis of the report

1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

- ☐ This report is based on translations from the original language into the following language _____, which is language of a translation furnished for the purpose of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
- ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
- ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report)*:

- ☐ The international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☒ the description:
- pages _____ 1-33 _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the claims:
- pages _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
- pages* _____ 1-32 _____ received by this Authority on 08 November 2004 (08.11.2004)
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the drawings:
- pages _____ 1/9-9/9 _____, as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to sequence listing (*specify*): _____

4. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (*specify*): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to sequence listing (*specify*): _____

* If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.
PCT/EP 03/11959

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-32	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-14, 16, 20, 21, 23-32	YES
	Claims	15, 17-19, 22	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-32	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

Available prior art

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE 198 36 745 A1, cited on page 2 of the description

D2: US-A-5 537 626, cited in the search report

Preliminary observation

In the examiner's opinion, the scope of the claims of 8 November 2004 appears to go beyond the scope of the claims as originally filed (PCT Article 19(2)). In the description the examiner can find no basis for broadening the scope of protection from an electrophotographic printing system to a printing system in general.

1. Claims 1 to 14

1.1 D1 is the prior art closest to the subject matter of claim 1 and discloses in figure 4 an electrophotographic printing and copying system

having two interconnected printing units 20/1 and 20/2. Each of these printing units comprises an operator station 22/1 and 22/2 respectively and a controller 21/1 and 21/2 respectively. The operator stations and/or controllers are interconnected by means of data lines 27, 28, 29, and they exchange operating information, control data and parameters with each other (see, for example, column 5, lines 17 to 29).

The subject matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that a controller makes a server available for an operator station as client so that at least some of the transmissible and normally not accessible internal control data is input and/or output via the operator station. The subject matter of **claim 1** therefore appears to be novel over the available prior art D1 (PCT Article 33(2)).

The subject matter of **claim 1** can also be considered inventive since, for a person skilled in the art, there is nothing in the available prior art to suggest the solution to the problem of interest (PCT Article 33(3)). There is likewise nothing in another document, D2, to suggest the provision, by the controller, of server services to an operator station.

- 1.2 Independent **claim 14** defines the method corresponding to claim 1, and its subject matter therefore likewise appears to be novel and inventive. The same applies to **claims 2 to 13**, which are dependent on claim 1 (PCT Article 33(2) and (3)).

2. Claims 15 to 22

2.1 In claim 15 it is not clear whether the information referred to is information originating from or concerning control data, nor is it clear how access to the control data is facilitated with the aid of the information.

2.2 D1 discloses a system for the management and transmission of control data of a printing system with a central database, i.e. table for information of control data of the printing system, to which a controller has access (see column 2, lines 3 to 15 and 35 to 36: table of parameters; and figure 4, and column 5, lines 22 to 39: memory SP1).

The subject matter of claim 15 differs from D1 in that the information in the database has a hierarchical structure to provide easier access to the data. The subject matter of claim 15 therefore appears to be novel over the available prior art D1 (PCT Article 33(2)).

A table usually presents an ordered compilation of data and information stored relationally and in a hierarchically organised structure. It is immediately clear that the purpose of such a structure is to enable specific values to be located quickly and simply.

A person skilled in the art would therefore create a control data information table, such as that known from D1 for example, so that the controllers have rapid and secure access to the required data without complicated search algorithms and the like. The

subject matter of **claim 15** cannot therefore be considered inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

2.3 The subject matter of dependent **claims 17 to 19** and of **method claim 22** is not inventive for the same reasons (PCT Article 33(3)).

2.4 The subjects defined by **claims 16, 20 and 21** are neither disclosed nor suggested by the available prior art (PCT Article 33(2) and (3)).

3. **Claims 23 to 28**

3.1 It is not clear whether claim 23 defines control data for the operator station or control data of the printer system.

3.2 As already stated under point 1.1 above, the D1 printing system discloses two printer units each having an operator station and a controller. Operator stations or controllers are interconnected in a master-slave arrangement (see figure 4, column 4, lines 37 to 55, and column 6, lines 53 to 59).

D1 (figure 2 and column 5, lines 17 to 29) indicates that control data is made available from a controller GS for an operator station BE. When two printing units are attached, it is also possible for a first operator station to make control data available to a second operator station (see column 6, lines 33 to 39).

The subject matter of claim 23 differs from D1 in that the master controller makes its control data

available to both operator stations, evidently to ensure that both operator stations receive the same data. The subject matter of **claim 23** therefore appears to be novel over the available prior art D1 (PCT Article 33(2)).

The subject matter of claim 23 can be considered inventive, since there is nothing in the available prior art to suggest to a person skilled in the art that the master controller of a printer system makes its data directly available to both operator stations (PCT Article 33(3)).

- 3.3 Independent claim 28 defines the method corresponding to claim 23 and is therefore likewise to be considered novel and inventive; the same applies to claims 24 to 27, which are dependent on claim 23 (PCT Article 33(2) and (3)).

4. **Claims 29 to 32**

- 4.1 It is not clear whether the parameters defined in claims 29 and 32 constitute operating information or internal control data or how the parameters in the different printing units are linked.
- 4.2 D1 discloses a system for the input and/or output of parameters of a printing or copying system. In that system, parameters are automatically transmitted from the operator station of one printing unit to a linked printing unit and modified (see column 2, lines 3 to 15 and 35 to 50).

Claim 29 differs from D1 in that the two parameter values in the two printing units are linked and in

that, in the linked state, the second value is modified by the same amount as the first value. This makes it possible easily to modify parameters which do not necessarily have the same values but only have to be modified in the same manner.

The subject matter of **claims 29 and 30 to 32** is therefore to be considered novel over the available prior art D1 (PCT Article 33(2)). For a person skilled in the art there is, furthermore, nothing in D1 to suggest such linking of parameters. The subject matter of claims 29 to 32 is therefore also to be considered inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

5. The subjects of claims 1 to 32 are industrially applicable.

Observations on entry into the regional phase (EP)

As stated in the written opinion of 30 July 2004, the set of claims as originally filed lacks unity of invention. The applicant is advised that the present set of amended claims also **lacks unity**, since no common special technical features can be identified (PCT Rule 13):

Claims 1 to 14: Control system having an operator station for a printing and copying system with a client-server link between an operator station and a controller

Claims 15 to 22: System for the management and transmission of control data of a printing and copying system using

a central database of
hierarchically structured
information

Claims 23 to 28: Printing and copying system
having at least two printing
units in a master-slave
arrangement

Claims 29 to 32: Printing and copying system
having at least two printing
units, in which system linked
parameters are modified.

This should be taken into account on entry into the
regional phase (EP).
